

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One replacement sheet of drawings is attached hereto in the APPENDIX. This sheet includes revisions to Figure 1 and replaces the drawing sheet containing Figure 1 originally filed. An annotated sheet showing changes to Figure 1 is also included in the APPENDIX. Specifically, Figure 1, is now revised to illustrate the suction generator 36.

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action of 27 February 2007. In response the applicants revise the priority claim in the first paragraph of the application in order to properly reference the parent application. In addition, the specification is amended on pages 3, 9 and 11 to correct the spelling of the term “xenon”. Further, Figure 1 is amended to illustrate the suction generator 36 and appropriate replacement and annotated drawing sheets are submitted.

The applicants also amend independent claims 1 and 12 to more clearly patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art. In addition, claims 9 and 20 are amended to correct a typographical error. Still further, claims 3, 4, 14 and 15 are canceled without prejudice. With the cancellation of these claims, no further drawing amendments are required.

The substantive rejections will now be discussed in detail.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS
BEING ANTICIPATED BY U.S. PATENT 5,311,639 TO BOSHIER**

The Boshier patent discloses a cleaning device 40 for special applications including a vacuum cleaner 80 connected to a tubular borescope 42 equipped with a viewing window 48. Lighting is provided through the window 50 by means of a fiber optic bundle which communicates via transmission line 66 with a suitable light source (see Figures 2 and 3 and the text at column 5, lines 4-30).

As amended, claim 1 reads on a canister vacuum cleaner having a light source carried on the canister vacuum cleaner at a first point and a light transmitter extending along the hose and wand of the vacuum cleaner from the light source to a second point on the canister vacuum cleaner remote from the light source whereby light from the light source is directed past the second end of the wand onto a surface being cleaned. Support for the amendment to claim 1 (and claim 12 discussed below) is found throughout the specification including, for example,

on page 10 and in Figure 4.

The standard for lack of novelty or “anticipation” is one of strict identity. In *In re Donohue*, 766 Fed.2d 531, 534, 226 USPQ 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985) it was stated that “an anticipation rejection requires a showing that each limitation of the claim must be found in a single reference, practice or device.”

The cited patent to Boshier does not disclose the concept of providing a light source on the canister vacuum cleaner. Further, Boshier does not teach providing any structure for illuminating an “open” work space. Further, Boshier does not disclose the concept of providing a light transmitter extending along a hose and wand from a light source at a first point to a second point on a canister vacuum cleaner remote from the first point. For these reasons, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 11 patentably distinguish over the Boshier reference and should be allowed.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 6, 10 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY U.S. PATENT 5,207,498 TO LAWRENCE ET AL.

The Lawrence et al patent discloses a power head for a canister vacuum cleaner equipped with a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. The Lawrence et al patent very clearly does not disclose a light transmitter extending along the hose and wand from a light source at a first point to a second point on a canister vacuum cleaner remote from the first point. Thus, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 6, 10 and 11 very clearly patentably distinguish over this art and should be allowed.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION WITH PUBLISHED U.S. PATENT APPLICATION 2003/0182756 TO DUGGAN

As noted above, the Lawrence et al patent discloses a power head for a canister vacuum

cleaner equipped with a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. The Duggan reference is cited for its disclosure of a dirt cup having a cylindrical side wall and a tangentially directed inlet. Whether considered alone or in combination, neither of these references disclose a canister vacuum cleaner incorporating a light transmitter that extends along the hose and wand as claimed. Accordingly, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over this art and should be allowed.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION
WITH PUBLISHED U.S. PATENT APPLICATION 2003/0196293 TO RUFF**

As noted above, the Lawrence et al patent discloses a power head for a canister vacuum cleaner equipped with a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. The Ruff reference is cited for its disclosure of a light emitting diode for illuminating a work area in front of a vacuum cleaner. Neither of these references discloses a vacuum cleaner incorporating a light transmitter that extends along the hose and wand as set forth in claim 1 from which claim 5 depends. Accordingly, these references fail to provide a proper basis for the rejection of claim 5 which should be formally allowed.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE WHEN CONSIDERED IN
COMBINATION WITH U.S. PATENT 5,896,618 TO WOO ET AL.**

As noted above, the Lawrence et al reference discloses a power head for a canister vacuum cleaner equipped with a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. The Woo et al reference is cited for its disclosure of a halogen bulb for lighting a work area in front of a vacuum cleaner. Neither of the cited references provides any teaching to make it obvious to one skilled in the art to provide a canister vacuum cleaner with a light transmitter extending along the hose and wand as set forth in claim 1 from which claim 7-9 depend. Accordingly, these references

fail to provide a proper basis for the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and these claims should be allowed.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12-13, 17, 21 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER U.S. PATENT 6,003,196 TO WRIGHT ET AL WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION WITH THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE

The Examiner considers the Wright et al reference as disclosing a state of the art vacuum cleaner. The Examiner combines this reference with the Lawrence et al reference which teaches a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. Significantly, both the light source and the light pipe in the Lawrence et al reference are provided on the power head of a canister vacuum cleaner. Neither of the cited references teach or suggest providing a vacuum cleaner wherein a light transmitter is provided extending along the wand and hose assembly as explicitly set forth in present claim 12. Accordingly, the references fail to provide a proper basis for the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 and claim 12 as well as claims 13, 17, 21 and 22 dependent thereon should be formally allowed.

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 13, 17, 21 AND 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER U.S. PATENT 5,331,715 TO JOHNSON ET AL WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION WITH THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE

The Johnson et al reference, like the Wright et al reference discussed above, is cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of a state of the art upright vacuum cleaner. Significantly that upright vacuum cleaner does not incorporate a light transmitter extending along the hose and wand of the vacuum cleaner nor does the Johnson et al reference in any way make a provision of such a structure obvious to one skilled in this art. The secondary reference to Lawrence et al only teaches the concept of equipping a power head of a canister vacuum cleaner with a light source 24 and a light pipe 40. Whether considered alone or in combination, neither of the cited

references teach or suggest providing a floor cleaning apparatus incorporating a light transmitter which extends along the wand and hose assembly of that apparatus as set forth in claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 should be allowed. Claims 13, 17, 21 and 22 depend from claim 12. Since they are rejected on the same grounds they are equally allowable for the same reasons.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIM 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER THE JOHNSON ET AL REFERENCE WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION
WITH THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE AND THE RUFF REFERENCE**

As noted in the above comments, none of the cited references teach or suggest providing a vacuum cleaner with a light transmitter extending along the wand and hose assembly as set forth in claim 12 from which claim 16 depends. Further, whether considered alone or in combination, none of these references in any way suggest such a structure so as to make it obvious to one skilled in the art. Accordingly, the cited references fail to provide a proper basis for the rejection of claim 16 which should be formally allowed.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 18-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE
OVER THE JOHNSON ET AL REFERENCE WHEN CONSIDERED IN COMBINATION
WITH THE LAWRENCE ET AL REFERENCE AND THE WOO ET AL REFERENCE**

As noted above, none of the cited references in any way teach or suggest the concept of providing a vacuum cleaner equipped with a light transmitter extending along the hose or wand of the vacuum cleaner. Accordingly, these claims patentably distinguish over this art and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In summery, all the pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and should be formally allowed. Upon careful review and consideration it is believed the Examiner will

agree with this proposition. Accordingly, the early issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KING & SCHICKLI, PLLC



Warren D. Schickli

Registration No. 31,057

247 North Broadway
Lexington, KY 40507
(859) 252-0889

Serial No. 10/786,653

APPENDIX